

## REMARKS

The examiner objected to claim 15 as being dependent on claim 13 when it should be dependent on claim 14.

The claim have been so amended.

The examiner rejected claim 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 18 as being obvious over Ho in view of Nemeth.

The examiner rejected claim 7 as being obvious over Ho in view of Korchagin et al. since Korchagin et al. shows the use of a second elevator. The examiner is using the applicant's own publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against him. The publication was incorporated by reference into the application, at page, 5 referring serial number 10/431,946 and can not be used a reference against him.

Claim 7 should therefore be allowed.

The examiner rejected claim 8 as being obvious over Ho in view of Korchagin et al. since Korchagin et al. shows the use of a second elevator having a crane. The examiner is using the applicant's own publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against him. The publication was incorporated by reference into the application and can not be used a reference against him.

Claim 8 should therefore be allowed.

The examiner rejected claim 14 as being obvious over Ho in view of Korchagin et al. since Korchagin et al. shows the use of a second elevator. The examiner is using the applicant's own publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against him. The publication was incorporated by reference into the application and can not be used a reference against him.

Claim 14 should therefore be allowed.

The examiner rejected claim 15 as being obvious over Ho in view of Korchagin et al. since Korchagin et al. shows the use of a second elevator having a crane. The examiner is using the applicant's own publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against him. The publication was incorporated by reference into the application and can not be used a reference against him.

Claim 15 should therefore be allowed.

The examiner rejected claim 16 as being obvious over Ho in view of Korchagin et al. since Korchagin et al. shows the use of a second elevator having a crane and a pod attached to the crane. The examiner is using the applicant's own publication 2004/0262086 as a reference against him. The publication was incorporated by reference into the application and can not be used a reference against him.

Claim 16 should therefore be allowed.

The examiner rejected claim 6 as being obvious over Ho in view of Bates which teaches a corner corridor portion 14.

The Bates patent does not show connecting corridors as the applicant claims. Bates has an elevator 14 with platforms 29 on either side of the elevator which is in the corner.

The applicant has elevators along the face of the building with corridors having connections at the corner of the building. Therefore the combination of Ho and Bates does not teach the invention.

Claim 6 should be allowed.

Claim 17 has been cancelled.

Claim 18 should be allowed since it is dependent on allowable claim 13.

Claims 1 and 13 should be allowable since Ho does not show an elevator car since there is no enclosure on the Ho elevator. The applicant claims an elevator car because the car is enclosed. The enclosed car then meets with the enclosed corridor in later claims to form an enclosed safe area for passengers. This feature is lacking in Ho.

All dependent claims from allowable claims 1 and 13 should also be allowable.